

The North Carolina Standard.

PHILO WHITE,
EDITOR, AND STATE PRINTER.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES.....THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C....THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1836.

VOL. II...NO. 72.
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED
BY NATHANIEL O. BLAKE.

TERMS.

Three dollars per annum, payable half-yearly in advance; but it will be necessary for those living at a distance, or out of the State, to pay an entire year in advance. A subscriber failing to give notice of his desire to discontinue at the expiration of the period for which he may have paid, will be considered as having subscribed anew, and the paper continued, at the option of the Editor, until ordered to be stopped; but no paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid.

Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

Advertisements will be inserted at the rate of one dollar per square for three insertions. A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year. Those sending in Advertisements will be good enough to mark the number of times they wish them inserted.

6,000 Dollars for 4 Dollars!

THE 3rd CLASS of the NORTH CAROLINA STATE LOTTERY, for 1836 is to be drawn on the popular Fertilizing Figure System, on Saturday, the 19th March, 1836, at Hillsboro', N. C.

PRINCIPAL PRIZES.

- 1 Prize of \$6,000, is \$6,000
- 1 Prize of 3,000, is 3,000
- 1 Prize of 2,000, is 2,000
- 10 Prizes of 1,000, is 10,000
- 12 Prizes of 500, is 6,000
- 15 Prizes of 300, is 4,500
- 15 Prizes of 200, is 3,000

Besides many of \$100, \$50, \$30, \$20, &c. &c.

Amounting in all to \$180,000.

Tickets only \$4. Halves 2, Qrs. 1. A certificate for a package of 10 whole tickets will cost only \$23. Halves and Quarters in the same proportion. To be had, in the greatest variety of numbers, at

STEVENSON & POINTS' Office,
RALEIGH, N. C.

ARCHER TEVCH,
Watch-Maker and Jeweller.

RESPECTFULLY informs the public in general and the Members of the Legislature, that he has situated himself in the Store formerly occupied by Mr. John P. Moore, and has fitted it up expressly for this business. He feels thankful for the liberal encouragement received since his commencement in business, and hopes to merit a continuance of the same, by his constant attention and punctuality. He has just received from the North a fine assortment of **Jewelry and Watches**, consisting of Gold and Silver Patent Levers; plain English and French Watches; Gold Chains, Keys, Breast-Pins, Ear-Rings and Finger-Rings, together with a variety of other Articles too tedious to mention; which he now invites all to call and examine for themselves. He pledges himself to sell as cheap as can be obtained elsewhere.

He will bestow his attention individually to the Repairing of Watches, and would particularly inform the Members of the General Assembly, that all work confided to him shall be strictly attended to, and warranted to perform well.

Jewelry repaired; and Engraving neatly executed.

Raleigh, Nov. 12th 1835. 51

CHARACTER.

FROM the solicitations, as well of those who own, as those who have seen the Colts of this superior breed, I am again induced to stand him, alternately at my stable near Raleigh, and in the city of Raleigh, the next season, commencing the 1st of March, and ending the 15th of July.

CHARACTER'S blood is considered by good judges to be equal, if not superior, to that of any race-horse in N. C., as will appear from his pedigree. He is a beautiful sorrel, five feet three inches high, strongly made, was got by the celebrated Old Sir Archy, his dam by the imported Druid, grand-dam by the famous Old Mark Anthony, great grand-dam through bred by the imported Old Jolly Roger. His Colts are large and likely, some of them have run successfully on the Turf, as also has their Sire—all of which can be satisfactorily proven to any person.

Good pasturing grass, and grain fed to them, at 25 cents per day, when at the subscriber's. For further particulars, see hand-bills.

SETH JONES.

Pomona, 14 miles N. E. of Raleigh, N. C. 1876.

February 20th, 1836.

N. B.—In all probability this will be the last season Character will stand in this State, as he will be sold, or sent to the West, at the end of the season.

State of North Carolina,

YANCEY COUNTY. Superior Court of Law, Fall Term, 1835 Rachel McGee vs. James McGee; Petition for Divorce. It appearing to the court that the defendant is a non-resident of this state, it is ordered that publication be made for six successive weeks, in the North Carolina Standard, notifying the defendant to be and appear at the next superior court of law to be held for the county of Yancey, at the court house in Burnsville, on the first Monday after the fourth Monday in March next, then and there to plead, answer, or demur to the said petition, or judgment will be entered pro confesso, and the case set for hearing ex parte.

[673] Test. J. W. MELROY, CLK.

NEW BOOKS, just received and for sale at the North Carolina Book Store, (viz.)

- Horne's Introduction, new edition, 2 vols.
- Nichols's Church History do do do
- Nichols's Rome, 2 vols. Faber on Infidelity, 1 v.
- Tyler's Large Universal History, 2 vols.
- Allen's Life of Scott, 1 vol.
- Curiosities of Literature, 1 vol.
- History of the Horse, (published by D. Green) 1 v.
- Canning's Select Speeches, 1 vol.
- Memoir of the Rev. John H. Rice, D. D. 1 v.
- Clerical Manners and Habits, by Dr. Miller, 1 vol.
- The Pilgrims of Walsingham, 2 vols.
- Knowledge for the People, 3 vols.
- The Christian Florist, Flora's Dictionary.
- Christian Tales, London Religious Souvenir.
- Social Tales for the young, (by Mrs. Sherwood)
- Sword's Pocket Almanack.
- Presbyterian P.cket Calendar.

TURNER & HUGHES.
Raleigh, Jan. 26th, 1836.

Mess. NEWLAND and GRAHAM.

House of Representatives, February 26.
CONTESTED ELECTION.

The House resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Elections, on the contested election from North Carolina.

The Speaker, stated the question to be, first, on making the report the special order for Wednesday next, the motion of Mr. W. B. Shepard, being understood by the Chair to have been withdrawn.

Mr. Shepard reminded the Chair that he had not withdrawn his motion, although he had intimated an intention of so doing.

The Chair said that the Journal so stated; and it was also his own impression that the gentleman had withdrawn his motion. The Journal could, however, be corrected.

Mr. W. B. Shepard said, when he made the motion to postpone the subject for three weeks, he did so because the Chair was about to put the question on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. Boyd,) to make it the order of the day for Wednesday next. He felt sensible that it was impossible, in that short space of time, for gentlemen to give the documents that careful examination which they required to come to a correct decision. Every gentleman must be familiar with the difficulty of examining into such a matter. He had, however, since learned from his colleague, the sitting member, that his motion had, in some degree, interfered with the disposition which was intended to be made of the matter. It appeared that a gentleman from the Committee of Elections had made a proposition, which he understood to come from the minority of that committee, that the subject should be recommitted to that committee for the purpose of taking further testimony in the case. He therefore, intended to withdraw his proposition to postpone for three weeks, but he did so with the distinct understanding that the sitting member should be permitted to procure all the testimony necessary, and have his claims to his seat clearly stated before the House came to act upon it. He hoped the House would send the matter back to the Committee, and give the sitting member time to make out his case as fully as possible; and there was nothing inconsistent in giving the subject that direction. He confessed he was mortified to hear his colleague, (Mr. Bynum,) say, that the sitting member had misrepresented his district on that floor. Did he mean that the sitting member was wasting the time of the House in unprofitable discussion, which served only to fill the columns of a filthy newspaper? If he meant to say that, when a gentleman came to the House of Representatives, by the vote of a majority of the people of his district, and attested by the proper officers, that that man misrepresented his constituents, he thanked God that he misrepresented him in the same way. How did the sitting member come there? He came with the certificate of election, from the proper officers. Then, if you refuse to give him an opportunity to show that he is entitled to his seat, you stamp the charge of falsehood upon the return officers. Mr. S. said, he had made these remarks with no understanding with the sitting member, or with the members on the Committee of Elections. He did not know the nature of their report; and he had not the facility of intellect of his colleague, (Mr. Bynum,) to enable him to jump to conclusions without examination. He was willing the characters of gentlemen there should stand unimpeached until they were proved to be otherwise. He did not know the nature either of the majority or minority report, and he would not express an opinion in the case, until he could examine it. He neither knew nor cared who they said was entitled to the seat; all he asked was that the House would not prejudice it before the necessary testimony could be procured. If the House took up this matter at an early day, it would deny the right of being heard, to a large and respectable District of North Carolina; and on this subject they ought to hear every thing. His colleague (Mr. Bynum) had told them that the present subject had been before the House for four months. The House had not yet been in session four months; and during the time it had been in session, the subject was before the Committee of Elections; and how could any one there have ascertained anything of the matter, except by going before the committee? And that would not have been the parliamentary course. It was utterly impossible to get the facts of the case, except by having time to examine it.

Mr. Bynum said he sincerely regretted the course he perceived the discussion was likely to take. His honorable friend and colleague, (Mr. W. B. Shepard,) a day or two since, expressed surprise and regret at the course taken in relation to this matter; he must confess that that gentleman entertained no more surprise and regret at the course he (Mr. B.) was about to pursue, than he felt at the course and proposition which that gentleman himself had made. He then thought, and he still thought, that upon that occasion, the gentleman himself had manifested extraordinary and unnecessary sensibility. A gentleman who spoke the other day, and his colleague, who had just addressed the House, had expressed their astonishment at a statement which he had made, wishing a speedy termination of that question. He thought they had done him a little injustice in supposing that he was actuated from any motive less honorable and patriotic than themselves. They had also done him injustice, no doubt unintentionally, in misrepresenting his motives in respect to his colleague, the sitting member. He never intended to be understood as saying that that gentleman had misrepresented his district. What he had said was this, that if that gentleman was not the legitimate representative on that floor, the people of that district had been long enough misrepresented. He had not expressed an opinion, but he again repeated, that if that gentleman was not entitled to a seat on that floor, he had been long enough there. He agreed most fully with his colleague, when he said they should not act until they had all the lights in the case which could be had; and until the documents were published and laid before the House. He should be the last man to urge the matter, until the documents were printed and laid upon the table of every member of the House. He again repeated, that he was astonished at the remarks of his friend on the right, (Mr. A. H. Shepard,) and his colleague on the left, (Mr. W. B. Shepard,) when they endeavored to impeach him of having brought a charge against the sitting member. The simple statement was, that if he was not the legitimate Representative, there had been a sufficiency of misrepresentation. He himself was not decided upon the subject; he wanted to have more light, as well as the gentleman himself; but from what he had understood, if he might be permitted to express an opinion, he was predisposed to believe that the sitting member was not entitled to his seat.

The Chair remarked that the gentleman was not in order, in entering into the merits of the question before the main question came up.

Mr. Bynum said he should endeavor to confine himself to the question before the House. He did believe that the motion of his colleague (Mr. W. B. Shepard) went to postpone the question longer than was absolutely necessary to have the House placed in possession of all the information necessary. For that reason he had opposed that motion, and still opposed it. He had been informed by those who had conversed with the printers to the House on the subject, that the documents would be printed and laid on the tables within eight or ten days; and they had also been told, that when the documents were laid on the tables, the whole subject could be investigated in a few hours. Then where could be the necessity for postponing the subject three weeks? The gentleman who had just taken his seat, had made some remarks which he did not distinctly understand. He supposed a case, and supposed that if he (Mr. Bynum) meant to say that the individual who occupied a seat on that floor did so for the purpose of filling the columns of a newspaper, that he had made an erroneous charge. He did not understand the gentleman's allusion, and should like to be correctly informed.

Mr. W. B. Shepard said, the remarks he had made were general. He had said that he did not exactly understand what his colleague (Mr. Bynum) meant when he said the sitting member misrepresented his constituents on that floor. He further said, that if his colleague meant that any individual used his station there to get up useless discussions and unnecessary squabbles, to fill the columns of a newspaper, such an allusion would make any gentleman feel uneasy in his seat.

Mr. Graham proceeded. He was about to state the reasons, and he was borne out by the facts why the sitting member should have an opportunity of placing the whole evidence before the House.

The depositions commenced on the 29th of Oct. and continued step by step, day after day, in constant succession, keeping the sitting member in constant attendance for upwards of twenty days, until he was compelled to take his departure for Washington city.

The Mountain district, which Mr. G. had the honor to represent, was not only one of the most populous in point of numbers, but for extent of territory was perhaps the largest in the United States. The population was sparse, but the district was nearly two hundred miles in length, and about eighty or ninety in width, being shaped like an ell. Now, how was it possible for mortal man to have traveled over this whole space, and collect and investigate testimony in so short a time? This was one reason why, in justice, he asked for further time to enable him to lay the whole of the evidence before the House.

Mr. G. then entered into a lengthy statement of the proceedings before the Committee on Elections on the subject of a protest he had offered, and of his application to be heard on the principles of that paper. From the Christmas holidays he had heard nothing from the committee, until about the 15th or 16th of January, when the committee assembled and desired to know if the parties had anything further to say. The sitting member then informed them that he had anxiously and confidently hoped that his protest would have been passed upon, and an extension of time given him to collect further testimony. Some time afterwards he was notified by the chairman of the committee that further time would not be allowed, and Mr. G. supposed he had then no right to make the motion in the House, because it had referred the whole subject to the committee. These were substantially the facts upon which he grounded his appeal to the House, that further time should be given him to take depositions.

Mr. Howard desired to make an inquiry of the committee, the necessity of which sprang from the remarks of the gentleman who had just taken his seat. It was proper that the inquiry should be made and promptly answered, because something like censure had been imputed to the committee. A report had been brought in from a standing committee of the House, after two months of inquiry; and upon the very same day that that report was brought in, the House was called upon to grant farther time to take depositions. From the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina, (Mr. Graham,) it appeared, that on the 15th or 16th of January last, he applied to that committee for the privilege he then sought to obtain at the hands of the House. Now, if the House should undertake to grant that time, it struck Mr. H. that it would be entertaining an appeal from the decision of that committee, and reversing its opinions. They would be casting an implied censure upon the committee, for refusing to do, after mature deliberation, what the House itself saw fit to do the moment it was called upon.

The inquiry Mr. H. desired to make was this. He wished to know from the committee what were their reasons for refusing, about the 15th or 16th of January, further time to the sitting member, to take depositions? Being himself altogether ignorant of the merits of the case, and anxious to keep himself so until if he was in possession of the testimony, he put this inquiry in order that he might judge if the committee had erred or not in refusing to grant what the House was then called upon then to grant.

Mr. Boyd, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Maryland, (Mr. Howard,) and to the remarks of the sitting member, said he had to state that the evidence before the committee showed that the petitioner gave notice sixty-six days before the meeting of Congress of his intention to contest the election of the sitting member. It was true, as stated, that the first depositions were taken on the 29th of October; and from that time up to the meeting of Congress, the parties were each engaged in taking depositions; and as to the inconvenience complained of by the sitting member, that he was notified to take depositions at one point to-day, and at another seventy miles distant to-morrow, Mr. B. had only to say, that that inconvenience, if it could be called such, operated reciprocally. The fact was, each of the gentlemen attended, either by themselves or by their agents, all the appointments for taking depositions; and they examined and cross examined all the witnesses, except in one solitary instance, and in that case, the four or five days' notice was given him. The committee thought an equal opportunity had been given the parties for taking testimony, and that sixty-six days was a sufficient time to collect all the evidence necessary to enable that House to determine who was entitled to the contested seat. These were some of the reasons which induced the committee to reject the application of the sitting member for time to take additional testimony. It seemed to Mr. B. singular that gentlemen who thought further time should be given for taking testimony, should be found also urging the propriety of putting off the examination of the whole subject for more than three weeks. Ought they not rather, said Mr. B. to join in making this subject the special order of the day for Wednesday next, or some other early day, that they may act so soon as the testimony is printed and laid upon our tables? This course seemed to him to be the proper one, unless gentlemen were disposed to act without evidence, except such as should be furnished by the sitting member, and the individual members of the committee. He, (Mr. B.) had no feeling on this subject; in the whole investigation, of this case, he had been influenced alone by a desire to do justice to all concerned, and he had no doubt all the members of the committee had been actuated by a similar desire.

Mr. Hard merely wished to remark, in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. Boyd,) that the minority of the committee desired to put this matter off. He also wished to explain why he had submitted his motion to recommit. It would be recollected, that when the gentleman from Kentucky made this report of the majority of the committee, the sitting member objected to submit his protest, and it was also unanimously ordered to be printed, and Mr. H. had supposed that that paper furnished subject matter upon which the House could act. With that view, he had submitted the motion that the prayer or application of the sitting member might be granted. It also then occurred to him, and he still believed that motion in order, the House having granted their consent that he should submit his application; and he should still submit it, and insist upon his motion, and renew it, that the sitting member have further time to make an examination of the evidence.

Mr. Bynum said, he would, on all proper occasions, express his opinions, but as to consumption of the time of the House, he believed him and his colleague were on an equal footing. He did not say, however, that he had consumed too much time, for pleasure. His colleague seemed to regret that he was not possessed with the facility of intellect to judge of the present question without time. He believed that after the documents were printed and laid on the tables, every gentleman would be possessed

of sufficient facility of intellect to judge of the case without postponement of three or four weeks. He believed that most of the information which would be sought in them, was known now to the majority of the members of the House. Mr. B. would be the last man in the House to do an act of injustice to the sitting member; but while he would not do that gentleman injustice, he would be unworthy of maintaining a seat on that floor, was he to be guilty of committing an act of injustice to the gentleman who was petitioning for his seat. He was disposed to do both justice. His colleague had said that Mr. B. had stated that the subject had been before the House for four months. Mr. B. had remarked that if the motion was made and carried to postpone for three weeks, then it would have been before the House between three and four months. He hoped the House would not follow the example set them last winter, but that they would decide upon the subject speedily. In the case of the Moore and Letcher contested election, the documents were much more voluminous, and yet only one week was allowed for considering it after the documents were printed. With regard to his friend from N. Carolina, (Mr. Williams,) he had always had the profoundest respect for his opinions, and he approved his course apart from his political views, but it did appear to him, that to lay that subject on the table was rather undignified. He had looked over the Journal, and had never seen any disposition made of the report of a committee, but by making it the order for a particular day. He believed that the motion of the gentleman from N. York, (Mr. Mann,) to postpone it until Tuesday week, would allow ample time to examine the subject, and he hoped that motion would prevail.

Mr. Shepard then withdrew his proposition. Mr. Mann, of New York, then renewed his motion to postpone the subject till Tuesday week.

Mr. Graham (the sitting member) begged to inquire if the pending question was not the motion of the gentleman from N. York, a member of the Committee on Elections, (Mr. Hard,) to recommit?

The Chair stated that, under the thirty-second rule, that motion gave way to the motion to postpone. The Chair had made the same decision a few days ago, and in that opinion, independent of the rule, upon examination he found himself sustained by the *lex parliamentaria*.

Mr. Graham was desirous, he said, that the motion submitted by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hard,) should be decided by the House, before the question was taken on the postponement to a given day. It was true, and his colleague who had just taken his seat had remarked, that this was an important case; but it was more important that whenever a cause was about to be tried, it should be tried impartially, in such a way as to do justice between the parties, and to give satisfaction to the district interested in the issue. That was all he asked, and nothing more; and to which he humbly conceived he was entitled. He would not ask the House to try the cause without hearing the evidence for he held the House to be in the situation of judge and jurors. It would be thought very strange for a judge or juror, about to go into the investigation of a cause out of court or on the bench, before he had heard one word of the testimony, to express his opinion. It would be said he was forestalling the verdict, or, at least, that he had strong prejudices, and would not be considered as competent to give an impartial decision.

Mr. G. assured the House that he desired no delay, but sought for justice; and he would give to the House a few facts, to show the inconvenience to which the sitting member had been subjected. In the first place, the petitioner was in the situation of a plaintiff in a court of justice, who was necessarily in advance of the defendant with his testimony, and could not be taken by surprise. The defendant, like the sitting member in the present case, had no opportunity of knowing what testimony he should have to hunt up, nor what he should have to make replication to. Now the elections in North Carolina were held on the second Thursday in August. The petitioner (Mr. Newland) being one of the three candidates before the people, did not give the sitting member notice, until the second day of October, of his intention to contest the seat, having had nearly two months to ascertain, as well as he could, the nature and character of his testimony. Before that he did not think proper to take any stand, contrary to the general rule of contested elections where notice was very often given at the moment, though they were afterwards abandoned. The sitting member did not deem it his duty to take any active steps, until the petitioner had commenced taking his depositions. On Thursday, the 29th of October, the petitioner commenced, and continued through Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. He then went to another place thirty-eight miles off, and commenced taking depositions on the Monday following, continuing through Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. The notices were so arranged, that the sitting member attended with the petitioner. He then received a notice to attend some sixty-seven or sixty-eight miles on the Monday following; and he attended accordingly.

Mr. Bynum begged to inquire if it was in order for his colleague to go into a detail statement of the case at that stage of the proceeding?

The Chair replied that though the merits of the question were not opened, the gentleman had a right to state the grounds upon which he urged that the House should not postpone the subject to a day certain, or why he desired further time, with a view that the House should act on the motion to commit.

Mr. Bynum would then ask if it would not be an act of justice to admit the petitioner to a seat on the floor, either in person or by counsel, to reply to the statements made by the gentleman himself, which, it was evident, must be prejudicial to the petitioner?

Mr. Boyd again rose but the Speaker announced that the hour devoted to morning business had expired.

Mr. Rencher remarked that it was exceedingly important that this subject should be promptly decided, and, in order to effect that object, he moved that the rules of the House be suspended with a view to make some disposition of it; but the motion was rejected; yeas 105, noes, 58—nottwo-thirds voting in the affirmative.

JUDGE WHITE.
How does Judge White now stand before the People of the Union?

He was nominated for the Presidency—1st. By a Caucus of 11 members of Congress from Tennessee, (in December 1834) headed by Davy Crockett, and John Bell both notorious opponents of Gen. Jackson's Administration: The one an illiterate buffoon and bully, with scarcely learning enough to write or spell his own name correctly,—and the other a plotting and intriguing politician, and a friend of the U. States Bank.

2d. By a majority of the Alabama Legislature (shortly afterwards) composed of all the Whigs and Nullifiers in that body, headed by James Jackson, and James M. Calhoun; the one a violent enemy, personal and political, of Gen. Jackson, and the other a nephew of John C. Calhoun and like him an avowed and active nullifier,—assisted by a small section of the democratic Party, who were deluded into the belief that the Whigs and Nullifiers were candid in their professions and would have no candidate for their own party. This nomination made in January 1835, was in December of the same year, "Revoked and Rescinded," by the same legislature, by a vote of 43 to 36.

3d. By a convention of the Nullification party of Georgia, in the summer of 1835; who at the same time nominated Charles Dougherty, an avowed nullifier, for Governor of Georgia, and several other eminent nullifiers as candidates for Congress,—all of whom were afterwards beaten by large majorities, by candidates friendly to Mr. Van Buren the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, nominated by a National Convention of the friends of the present Administration.

4th. By the Legislature of Tennessee the State of his residence, and linked to him by selfish, neighborly and personal attachments alone. The first democratic of the State, however, consisting of such men as President Jackson, Felix Grundy, James K. Polk, William Carroll, Willie Blount, and Cave Johnson, opposed his nomination as improper, dangerous, and fraught with injury to the cause of Republicanism.

5th. Re-nominated by the Georgia Nullifiers, in caucus; with Philip P. Barbour, as Vice-President, who promptly refused the nomination, as opposed to all the principles of Democracy, and to the desires of an immense majority of the Republican Party.

6th. By a Caucus of the Whigs of the North Carolina Legislature,—who were in a small minority in that body, and had been defeated in all their efforts to place their own partisans in office, by the strength of the Democratic Party.

7th. By the Nullification White majority of the Virginia Legislature, in a Caucus at Richmond, composed of the *rag, tag and bob-tail* partisans, that had always opposed Gen. Jackson's administration in the Old Dominion.

8th. By a caucus of Whigs, Nullifiers, and straggling Jacksonmen, held at Tuscaloosa, and composed of the minority members of the Legislature, and a few citizens of the town who presumed to dictate an electoral ticket, formed partly of their own body, to the people of the State,—and that in a few days after a large majority of the Legislature had "rescinded and revoked" his nomination made the previous winter.

9th. And lastly, By the Senate of the Illinois Legislature, by a vote of 13 to 12 (one Van Buren member being absent, and two members violating their pledges)—all the Whigs voting for his nomination. The House of representatives of the Illinois Legislature, at the same time, nominated Mr. Van Buren for the Presidency, by a vote of 32 to 18, and reprobated in the strongest terms the nomination of Judge White, as a violation of the known wishes of a large majority of the people of the State.

A synopsis, of the various nominations of Judge White, which have been made, indicates completely the position he occupies before people of the Union, and evinces clearly the conclusion that he is but the Nullification Whig candidate, or at least one of them; and that if he does not coincide with the sentiments of that party, he at least permits himself to be used, as a tool to effect their purpose.—*Tusca, Flag*